

NSW Weed Risk Management assessment: *Olea europaea* ssp. *europaea*

(Return to: <http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/agriculture/pests-weeds/weeds/wrm-system>)

		<i>Olea</i>		
		<i>europaea</i>		
		ssp. <i>europaea</i>	European olive	
		Olive		
		Oleaceae		
	Area considered:	across Sydney basin		
	Landuse:	Nature conservation		
	Density:	High density in landuse		
		Standard weed management is site treatment with a range of labour-intensive tools.		
Invasiveness			Do not know	
Q1	score	3	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q2	score	3	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q3	a	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	b	1	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	c	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	total	1		
Q3	score	1		
Q4	a	2	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	b	2	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	c	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	d	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	total	4		
Q4	score	2		
Q5	a	2	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	b	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	c	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	d	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	total	2		
Q5	score	1		
Invasiveness score		10		
Impacts				
Q1	score	3	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q2	score	4	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q3	score	3	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q4	score	2	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q5	score	1	0.0	Some hay fever can occur.

Olea europaea ssp. *europaea* (cont.)

Q6	a	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	b	1	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	c	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	d	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	e	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	f	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	total	1		
Q6	score	1		
Impacts score		14		
Potential distribution				
	score	1	0.0	Estimate of 10-20% (higher than Virtue of 5-10%).
Comparative weed risk and Uncertainty scores				
	Corrected Invasiveness	6.7		
	Corrected Impacts	7.4		
	Corrected Potential distribution	1.0		
Comparative Weed Risk		49		
		Medium		
Uncertainty Invasiveness				
		0.0		
Uncertainty Impacts				
		0.0		
Uncertainty Potential Distribution				
		0.0		
Control costs				
Q1	a	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	b	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	c	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	d	1	0.0	In woodland.
	total	1		
Q1	score	1		
Q2	score	0	0.0	All sites likely to be readily accessible.
Q3	a	1	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment around \$100/ha.
	b	4	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment around \$1000/ha.
	c	1	0.0	Likely to be low equipment cost.
	total	6		
Q3	score	3		

Olea europaea ssp. *europaea* (cont.)

Q4	score	2	0.0	Weed control rarely undertaken in land use unless at specific sites.
Control costs score		6		
Persistence				
Q1	score	1	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q2	score	0	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q3	score	1	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
Q4	a	2	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	b	2	0.0	Virtue (2004) Native landuse WRM assessment.
	total	4		
Q4	score	3	0.0	
Persistence score		5		
Current Distribution				
				Below refers to feral populations. Planted groves are not planted in native vegetation areas. They are likely to be limited in area outside native vegetation areas at this stage in the basin as well.
Q1	score	0.1	0.0	Very little known to be present e.g. Jim Dellow's work and Herbarium records.
Q2	score	0	0.0	More than three outbreaks up and down the coast but not many small infestations in the basin.
Current Distribution score		0.1		
Comparative Feasibility of Coordinated Control and Uncertainty scores				
Corrected Control costs		5.0		
Corrected Persistence		4.5		
Corrected Current distribution		0.1		
Comparative Feasibility of Coordinated Control		2		
		Very High		
Uncertainty Control costs		0.0		
Uncertainty Persistence		0.0		
Uncertainty Current distribution		0.0		
Overall Uncertainty score		0		
Positive impacts		Commonly planted in orchards and gardens.		
Other comments		None		

Determining priorities

Olea europaea ssp. *europaea* (cont.)

Weed risk is MEDIUM

Feasibility of Coordinated control is VERY HIGH

On the Management action matrix the weed falls into the 'Contain spread' area (middle right of the matrix).

Suggested Management actions of 'Contain spread'

Aims to prevent the ongoing spread of the weed species in the geographic area being considered

Surveillance and mapping to locate all infested areas

Control of all infestations, aiming at local eradication where feasible. In close proximity to key sites/assets, aiming for a significant reduction in weed density.

Prevention of entry to geographic area, and movement of sale within.

Must not allow to spread from cultivated plants (if grown)

Monitor change in current distribution within and in close proximity to key sites/assets.

References

Virtue, J. (2004). 'Native landuse' sheet. Weed Risk Assessment Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Online at http://www.dwlbc.sa.gov.au/assets/files/wra_2004.xls Access date 27 June 2008.

That assessment focussed on unspecified "olive" but from experience it was probably European olive.